4-1990

Writing Apprehension and Writing Competency: Comparison between Whole Language Students and Skills Orientated Students

Lisa M. Friesen
The College at Brockport

WRITING APPREHENSION AND WRITING COMPETENCY: COMPARISON BETWEEN WHOLE LANGUAGE STUDENTS AND SKILLS ORIENTATED STUDENTS

THESIS

Submitted to the Graduate Committee of the
Department of Education and Human Development
State University of New York
College at Brockport
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science in Education

by

Lisa M. Friesen
State University of New York
College at Brockport
Brockport, New York

April, 1990

SUBMITTED BY:

Lisa M. Friesen — 4/3/90

Candidate — Date

APPROVED BY:

Gerard L. Begy — 4/3/90

Thesis Advisor — Date

Arthur E. Smith — 4/3/90

Second Faculty Reader — Date

Morris D. Beers — 4/5/90

Director of Graduate Studies — Date

ABSTRACT

Previous research on writing competency and writing apprehension suggests that the lack of one (competency) increases the level of the other (apprehension). The same also seems to be true for the reverse-- the greater the competency, the lower the apprehension. Yet, many questions still remain as to the causes of writing apprehension and how to elicit its reduction.

Researchers also contend that the whole language approach is more effective in instructing students how to write in terms of content, originality and creativity, as opposed to the basal/skills language program which concentrates on the mechanics of writing. This study combines the questions on writing competency and writing apprehension and the debate between whole language vs. basal/skills language programs. This study was conducted to determine: 1) if students participating in a whole language program exhibit a significant difference in writing apprehension to students participating in a basal/skills program and 2) if the same whole language students exhibit a significant different level of writing competency than their basal/skills language counterparts.

The study utilized four sixth grade classrooms, two participating in a whole language program and two in a basal/skills language program. Second grade reading scores were obtained to determined if the groups were the same in terms of reading achievement, which in

this case they were similar. The Writing Apprehension Test (Daly & Miller, 1975a) was administered to all students and scored as directed by the author. A writing sample was collected and scored according to the Basic Writing Scale (Wangberg & Reutten, 1986).

The results of this study indicated that the students showed no significant difference in writing apprehension regardless of the program in which they participated. A significant difference was found, however, between the groups in terms of writing competency. The whole language group scored significantly higher than the basal/skills language groups.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Why are so many people afraid to write? Gather a group of students, elementary children or college graduates, and ask them to take a piece of paper and write! Once the color returns to their cheeks, you will be bombarded with a multitude of questions: What are we to write about?, How long does it have to be?, What are you looking for?, Do we have to read it in front of the class?, Will it count for a **grade**? Invariably, many of them, regardless of their age or education, will be terrified and completely stumped on what to do and how to do it well.

So, why are we so afraid? It probably goes to back to our early writing instruction where the main goals of writing were to spell it right, write it neatly, and have straight margins. Yet, this fear of writing, although it may seem trivial at first, will influence how we view ourselves, what academic goals we set for ourselves, and what vocation we choose.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to determine if students engaged in a whole language program will be significantly different in their level of writing apprehension and the quality of their writing from those engaged in a skills orientated language program.

Questions

1. Is there a statistically significant difference in the level of writing apprehension from students engaged in whole language programs to those in basal/skills development programs?

2. Is there a statistically significant difference in the level of writer competency from students engaged in whole language programs to those in basal/skills development programs?

Need for the Study

Today's world demands that adults have a command of the written language, not only in reading, but in writing as well. Yet, a large portion of the population fail miserably in situations where writing is a necessity. This failure is due to an apprehension or anxiety that these individuals have about writing (Daly & Miller,

1975a). Individuals who are apprehensive about writing seldom engage in writing, write poorly when they are forced to write, and have a poor self concept about their writing (Daly & Miller, 1975c). In colleges and universities, incoming freshman have insufficient and unacceptable writing skills. In the work place, employers are having difficulty in finding and employing competent individuals with adequate writing skills (Fadiman & Howard, 1979).

Consequently, the high apprehensive writer's inferior writing skills and poor perception of his writing makes him more apprehensive and fearful of writing, forming a vicious circle. A question that remains is what came first-- the apprehension or the poor skill development?

If it is the poor skill development, then the problem that educators must address is to determine why the language arts programs of our schools are causing such fear of writing in students. Two such programs which are under scrutiny now are the traditional basal/skills development program and the whole language approach. Each program is succinctly different in how it handles the writing experience of the student. The whole language approach incorporates writing, all aspects of it, throughout the day and across the curriculum; the emphasis is on the *process* of writing. The skills orientated approach breaks down the writing process into mastery of its different components: mechanics, spelling, punctuation, grammar, and penmanship; the emphasis is on the *product* of writing. It stands

to reason, that each program might yield a different type of writer in terms of level of apprehension and quality of work.

Nearly all the previous research on writing apprehension and writer competency deal with identifying the levels of apprehension and competence of the student writer. None have studied and compared students in varying programs to determine if the programs produce a different kind of student writer.

Definition of Terms

Writing- "is the process of selecting, combining, arranging, and developing ideas in effective sentences, paragraphs, and often longer units of discourse" (NCTE Committee, 1979, p. 837).

Writing Apprehension- "a general avoidance of writing and situations perceived by the individual to potentially require some amount of writing accompanied by the potential for evaluation of that writing" (Daly & Miller, 1979, p. 37).

Writing Apprehension Test (WAT)- A self-report instrument, devised by John Daly and Michael Miller (1975a), that effectively measures writing apprehension. The scores (for students only) range from 26 to 130 with the mean score being 79.28 and the standard

deviation 18.86. For non-students, the range of scores is 21 to 105, the mean 55.27 and the standard deviation 15.37.

High Apprehensive Writer- someone who is so fearful of writing that s/he actively tries to avoid it. In terms of the WAT, a person scoring one or more standard deviations above the mean is considered a high apprehensive writer (Daly & Miller, 1975a).

Low Apprehensive Writer- someone who enjoys writing and engages in the activity by choice and with no anxiety. On the WAT, a person scoring one or more standard deviations below the mean is considered a low apprehensive writer (Daly & Miller, 1975a).

Whole Language- is a philosophy of teaching language in an holistic manner, going from the whole to the parts. Instruction begins with the complete story (the whole) and then breaks it down to the paragraph, the sentence, the words, and lastly, the sounds (the parts). The language processes (reading, writing, speaking, and listening) are taught in combination with each other and throughout the curriculum. Specific skills are taught in context as the need arises.

Basal/Skills Language Program- a language and/or reading program that breaks down the language processes into units of sequential bits of information. Once a unit is taught and mastered, the next sequenced skill is introduced.

Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations to this study. One is the varying teacher styles and degree of competence that will be present among the four participating classroom teachers. One teaching style, regardless of the language program, may increase or alleviate writing apprehension in the students, depending on that style and the teacher's own writing apprehension. Also, a more competent writing teacher will alleviate writing apprehension as a result of her academic training, teacher experience and/or her low writing apprehension.

A second limitation is the degree of honesty the students have in accurately answering the questions on the Writing Apprehension Test. Care will be taken to encourage the students to respond honestly and to convince them that only the researcher will see the answers and that their responses will not affect their school grades.

A third limitation is in the writing assignment to be collected. It is necessary to obtain a routine writing assignment that is indicative of the perspective program, in order to make a fair comparison of that program. Instructions given to the teachers would be to give a *creative* writing assignment, utilizing whatever methods they normally use, (pre-writing, related activities, skills lessons) and to have the students prepare and finalize the work (editing, conferencing, illustrating) as they do with routine assignments. Students should also be encouraged to do the very best work they can.

A fourth and final limitation is the small number of students participating in the study and the limited number of programs being compared.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Writing Apprehension

Overview

Writing apprehension, a term first defined by Daly and Miller (1975a), is characterized as "a general avoidance of writing and situations perceived by the individual to potentially require some amount of writing accompanied by the potential for evaluation of that writing" (Daly, 1979, p. 37). The highly apprehensive individual will generally go to great lengths to avoid situations which will involve writing, even when the consequence of the avoidance is more punishing than any obvious gains or rewards (Daly, 1979).

Writing apprehension decides for the individual his academic direction and occupational decisions. High apprehensive individuals will select courses and college majors that they perceive to involve little or no writing (Daly & Miller, 1975c; Daly & Shamo, 1978). These same individuals will also choose occupations that involve little or no writing because of their apprehension (Daly & Shamo, 1976).

Writing Apprehension and Self-Concept

In terms of self concept, writing apprehension is inversely correlated to the individual's self concept and to his rating of his own self-competence (McCroskey, Daly, Richmond & Falcione, 1977). High apprehensive students have no confidence in themselves in terms of their writing skills; they are unable to think of ideas, express themselves clearly and organize their thoughts into meaningful units (Heaton & Pray, 1982). Teachers' expectations and perceptions of their students are also influenced by their level of writing apprehension. Students who avoid writing and are apprehensive about it are evaluated more unfavorably by their teachers than those who have low apprehension (Daly, 1979). More importantly, students who avoid writing are perceived by their teachers "as (being) less successful in a variety of different academic subjects, less likely to succeed in the future, and less likely to receive positive recommendations from them to other teachers" (Daly, 1979, p. 42).

Writing Apprehension and Writing

Logically, high apprehensive individuals write differently from those who have low apprehension. Individuals with high apprehension score significantly lower on tests of writing skills than those with low apprehension (Daly, 1978). Also, apprehensive writers, when forced to write, write poorly, using fewer words per sentence, fewer sentences, less qualification in their statements (Daly, 1979) and less intense

language in their messages (Daly & Miller, 1975b). A study by Heaton and Pray (1982) showed that students with high writing apprehension, as determined by the Writing Apprehension Test, used significantly fewer words than low apprehensive students. These individuals view their writing as being less successful and inferior than those who exhibit low apprehension (Daly & Miller, 1975c). High apprehensive students do not like to write so they do not practice writing. Consequently, they have less chance to improve and they become poorer writers. The cycle continues.

Causes of Writing Apprehension

It is unclear whether writing apprehension precedes poor writing or poor writing causes writing apprehension. However, in order to solve both problems, the reasons why writers are apprehensive must be identified in order to give them the necessary instruction to alleviate their stress and improve their writing skills (Heaton & Pray, 1982).

Grades and teacher evaluation are the major contributor of writing apprehension. High apprehensive students fear writing because they are convinced they will make mistakes and get poor grades (Heaton, 1980; Heaton & Pray, 1982; Rosen, 1982). De Gutschow (1982), conducting a study on gifted student writers, noted that these writers considered a good paper was one that got an ***A***; a poor paper was one that didn't get an ***A***. Shaughnessy (cited by

Gorrell, 1982, p. 14) describes the fearful writer as "error-prone, hence fearful of writing and thus inhibited, inadequate in developing a topic":

> He is aware that he leaves a trail of errors behind him when he writes. He can usually think of little else while he is writing. But he doesn't know what to do about it. Writing puts him on the line, and he doesn't want to be there. For every 300 words he writes, he is likely to use some ten to thirty forms that the academic reader regards as serious errors. Some writers, inhibited by their fear of error, produce but a few lines an hour or keep trying to begin, crossing out one try after another until the sentence is completely tangled (Shaughnessy, 1977, p. 7).

Lack of mechanics, spelling errors, poor or incorrect grammar, insufficient vocabulary, and the teacher's red pencil contributes to the anxiety described above. Unfortunately, many writing classes focus on these very skills. Research has indicated that the concentration on the construction of the writing piece rather than the content has negatively affected the student writer (Graves, 1978). Red-pencilling students literary attempts have only aroused their fear of failure and increased their writing apprehension.

Penmanship is also a major cause of writing apprehension. Although the writing teacher knows that penmanship has nothing to do with the quality of writing, students as well as other adults equate good writing with good penmanship (Heaton & Pray, 1982). Parents of poor writers proclaim that their children can't write well because their handwriting is terrible (Heaton & Pray, 1982). Consequently, these students begin to feel the same way. Students who have good

penmanship feel confident about their writing because of their neat handwriting (Heaton & Pray, 1982).

Poor or insufficient instruction also yields an apprehensive writer. In a study by Heaton and Pray (1982), it was discovered that high apprehensive students become anxious when given a writing assignment with too little stimulus and too little time to think, write, and revise. Students also feel they have an inadequate amount of instruction and writing time (Heaton, 1980; Heaton & Pray, 1982). One student wrote in an autobiography, "In our grade school, we never had the opportunity to learn how to write decent. We didn't have much practice at all. And now in high school we have to do a lot of writing" (Heaton & Pray, 1982, p. 3). The writing program in most schools forces the student to be dependent on the teacher for all aspects of the writing task: theme, topic, purpose, time to write, audience, and criticism (Graves 1976). When any of the above areas is missing, as is often the case, the student writes poorly or not at all. The reasons for poor writers are inadequate teacher training in the area of writing, lack of time devoted to writing instruction, and the demand for accountability in the form of standardized tests (Graves, 1977; Walmsley, 1980).

The Teaching of Writing

Writing instruction has been a subject of much scrutiny and research in the past several years. The National Council of Teachers of English has developed a set of standards on which all writing programs should be based. Society demands that we write and write well, and the importance of developing quality, effective writing program in the school is essential.

The NCTE standards advocate that learning to write involves developing the skills of:

> *method of development* (narrating, explaining, describing, reporting, and persuading), *tone* (from very personal to quite formal), *form* (from a limerick to a formal letter to a long research report), *purpose* (from discovering and expressing personal feelings and values to conducting the impersonal business of everyday life), (to entertain a) *possible audience* (oneself, classmates, a teacher, the world) (NCTE, 1979, p. 837).

Writing instruction, therefore, needs to contain components necessary to achieve this goal. These components, outlined by the NCTE, are the use of writing in an integrated curriculum; the use of writing in all subject areas; utilization of the students' personal interests, needs, and experiences; the use of a variety of writing modes, audiences, purposes; appropriate class time and constructive criticism from a variety of sources (NCTE, 1979). Necessary, also, is instruction on how to express one's ideas, use of the conventions of edited

American English, and how to evaluate and revise one's writing (NCTE, 1979).

Writing instruction in the schools today, however, does not always resemble what was just described. Most writing instruction is done in the elementary level with a gradual decline of instruction time throughout the school program (Graves, 1978); and when writing instruction does occur, it is done in isolation from reading and other subjects, no integration is attempted (Graves, 1978; Rubin, 1980). Graves (1976), describes the "welfare mess of writing" (p. 645) where the student is totally dependent on the teacher for writing time, topic, audience, and evaluation. Workbook exercises, fill in the blank, and circle the correct response has become the norm of writing instruction. Students write in their assigned seats in silence without any cooperative learning or interaction with their peers (Rubin, 1980).

Testing practices have also reduced the students' ability in writing. Students are no longer tested with essay examinations but repeatedly with multiple choice, fill in the blanks, and true and false. One teacher stated in a study by Graves (1978) that writing isn't taught because it can't be tested. Principals and superintendents, under pressure to report the status of writing competency in their schools, demand concrete, objective, and measurable data on the students (Graves, 1976). This need for accountability and the ease of correction forces the teacher to rely on the instruction and evaluation

of the mechanics of writing: spelling, punctuation, capitalizations (Graves, 1976). James Squire (cited in Graves, 1977) states:

> Composing is not spelling. It is not grammar, not usage, not manuscript, not penmanship, not writing neat little snatches of perfectly formed sentences. It is neither writing with "two inch margins," nor with perfect alignment. It is not rhetorical analysis of selected passages, not is it completing a careful sequence of exercises on paragraph organization. Composing is none of these things (p. 819).

Teacher competence is another subject for research and scrutiny. Teachers, on the whole, are poorly prepared for the teaching of writing (Graves, 1977). Elementary teachers receive little or no formal training in their undergraduate or graduate programs; courses on writing theory or practice are not a requirement for certification in most states (Walmsley, 1980). In a survey of 36 universities, 169 courses were on reading, 30 in children's literature, 21 in language arts, and only 2 on writing instruction (Graves, 1978).

Reading and language arts textbooks play a major role in the writing program of schools. Ninety-five percent of all classroom instruction is based on subject area textbooks (Graves, 1977). This alarmingly high figure demonstrates the power of the textbook and the necessity of examining the content of these classroom materials. Yet, most of the activities in these language arts books are on the mechanical aspects of writing (Rubin, 1980). A study by Graves (1977) on eight textbooks from grades 2 and 5 showed that in grade 2, 31% of all activities were on writing: 17% on mechanics and 14% on

composing. In grade 5, 51% of all activities was on writing: 37% on mechanics and 14% on composing. The amount of composing remained unchanged but the amount of mechanics dramatically increased. Why so few activities on composing? A textbook publisher noted that textbooks with a lot of writing won't sell; teachers want easier correcting activities (Graves, 1977). Reading materials and textbook series will always cost more than a writing program series, but "reading sells and writing does not. For every one hundred dollars spent on reading materials, only one is spent on writing. For every two hours spent on teaching reading, only five minutes is spent on teaching writing" (Graves, 1978, p. 638).

Reduction of Writing Apprehension

Reduction of writing apprehension, once identified, must begin with a change in writing instruction. The students must be allowed to develop their own personal style of writing. They must be taught how to be an active participant in the three writing processes: pre-composing, composing, and post-composing (Graves, 1976). They need to become critical thinkers and evaluators, eliciting opinions from others as well as from themselves (Graves, 1976). They must develop a sense of audience, rediscover the playfulness of writing and understand the usefulness of its purpose (Graves & Calkins, 1980). Instruction should include pre-writing strategies such as pacing,

crumpling papers (Schiff, 1979), brainstorming, gathering and sifting for information (Clark, 1985) and cooperative learning. Instruction on writing and editing techniques, such as use of notecards, cutting and pasting, imagery, use of tape recorders, and again cooperative learning is also necessary. Publishing one's stories and sharing them with the class should become a familiar and comfortable situation (Clark, 1985). Activities such as field trips, experiments, film strips, book sharing, and debates should become frequent components of the curriculum (Schiff, 1979). Individualized attention, student-teacher conferencing, group and partner discussions on their writing, development of a positive attitude toward writing, acknowledgement for success, and encouragement of taking risks should be also become a part of the program (Bennett, 1981; Graves, 1976; Heaton, 1980; Rayers, 1987; Rosen, 1982; Tway, 1980). The most important component of writing instruction, however, is letting the students write and giving them the time to think, write, and revise (Heaton & Pray, 1982).

In De Gutschow's study (1982), appropriate instruction on pre-writing skills, sentence combining techniques, utilization of a variety of writing styles, sufficient writing time, and individualized teacher-student conference yielded a less anxious and better writing student. In other studies, if the writing process is emphasized and practiced without an over reliance on mechanics and spelling, the students will begin to develop a sense of phonic and grammatical rules on their own

(Bennett, 1981; Graves, 1978; Heaton & Pray, 1982; Josten, 1982) and an increase in writing and revising occurs (Rayers, 1987).

Writing apprehension will never completely disappear; at one time or another we all will experience it (Clark, 1985). The writing teacher will sense a touch of it before a lesson; the college student will feel it when asked to write a research paper and the graduate student will suffer from it when writing his/her thesis. But, writing is so important not only for our future but for ourselves; "the writing teaches the teacher about the fears, triumphs, and experiences of the student. The student teaches the teacher through the writing" (Clark, 1985, p. 31).

Whole Language

Overview

Whole language, by definition, is the philosophy of teaching, in a holistic manner, language. Language is the key trait of our species; it allows us to think, create, invent, conquer, discover, and most important of all, dream; and it is language that records and passes on these creations, discoveries, and dreams. Yet "language comes to life only when functioning in some environment. We do not experience language in isolation-- but always in relation to a scenario, some background of person, action, and events from which things are said to

derive their meaning" (Halliday, 1978, p. 28). Teaching in the whole language style allows the students to experience their language in this environment or context, using their own words as a key reading and writing source and their own environment as their frame of reference.

Children entering kindergarten or first grade already have extensive print awareness and knowledge (Osburn & Bobruk, 1981), and are interested in writing about themselves and about topics of their own choice (Hudelson, 1983). A study by Osburn and Bobruk (1981) cited several researchers, who determined that preschoolers and kindergartners are able to demand information, assert their opinions, question their environment, persuade their peers (Wood, 1976), predict events (Smith, 1978), use functional written language (Reid, 1960), and understand story structure (Stein & Glen, 1979). The way children are disciplined in their thoughts is influence by how they are exposed and instructed in language. "The type of thinking that is encouraged (in a whole language class) is that of synthesis. Synthesis requires the higher thought processes of evaluation, justification, classifying, grouping, and perceiving how the parts are alike or different" (Sinatra, 1984, p 5). The student, on his own initiative, determines for himself how the parts are related or diverse.

Language develops in a whole language classroom in the same manner that oral language develops in the home. The students experience the printed word; they are completely immerse with real literature stories, their own writing, and writing of their peers, signs

labels, directions, and purposeful print. They practice their reading and writing daily, in their own way and at their own pace, without fear of constant correction, peer pressure, labeling or failure. They use their background knowledge to interpret and understand the print they encounter and decide whether to include it in their schema or discard it (Ribowsky, 1985).

The whole language program integrates the curriculum throughout the day. Reading, listening, speaking, and writing comprise every aspect of their learning; each activity or lesson incorporates one or more of these modes. Within the language arts, all subjects (reading, writing, spelling, grammar, punctuation, phonics, and handwriting), are taught concurrently, in context and as the need arises. Reading instruction integrates semantic, syntactic, and phonographemic skills in the context of the child's reading (Maier, 1987). Within the school program, all subjects (science, social studies, health, and math) are instructed in a whole language manner. Concepts and vocabulary are taught in context, reading and writing are daily components of their study, listening and speaking activities are fostered and central themes are taught throughout the day encompassing all subjects.

Classroom Environment

A whole language classroom is distinctly different from all others. The teacher is more of a model than an instructor (Maier, 1987); she

conferences with the student, guides them, and evaluates their progress. Her many roles consist of consultant, coach, lesson leader, and preacher; her values include respect, people are good, activity is good, independence is essential, and originality is important; her teaching cues the use of other's work as examples, ignores inappropriate behavior, reminds the students of good behavior, and acts as a role model (Edelsky, Draper & Smith, 1983). Teachers in a whole language class are more relaxed and are able to enjoy and grow with their students (Salem, 1986).

The students are aware of the difference in a whole language classroom. They are active participants in their early learning (Salem, 1986) and feel like they are in control of their education (Ribowsky, 1985). They learn to learn for enjoyment as well as desire. The students make creative and "instrumental" decisions on their oral and written language learning (Slaughter, Haussler, Franks, Jilbert & Silentman, 1985). They experience their environment by imaginative engagement with literature; collaborate with peers; freely share their writings, opinions, and ideas; are encouraged to try out new ideas; take risks in their learning, and work through projects (Slaughter et al., 1985).

Components of the program are shared story telling, journal writing, sustained silent reading, thematic units, individual, small group and large group instruction, daily writing activities, and conferencing. Shared story telling includes the reading of a real

literature book and subsequent reading, writing or artistic activities related to the story (Slaughter et al., 1985). New words and reading skills are taught within the reading of the story as the situation arises. Journal writing and SSR are daily activities to help the student practice their language skills in a non-threatening environment. Thematic units are taught individually or in small or large groups depending on the interest of the children; when units are completed, groups are re-formed for new interest and units, thereby eliminating the labels of members in set reading groups. Daily writing and literacy activities are incorporated throughout the program in all subjects. Conferencing between the teacher and the student allows the individual student's needs to be identified and met and further instruction is then determined.

Whole Language vs. Basals

Published reading series or basals play a major role in the American educational system today. Over 95% of American schools use a commercialized published basal series (Morrow, 1987). Yet, despite the predominance of basal instruction in our schools, recent research has indicated that basal instruction is clearly not the most effective reading program. Osburn and Bobruk (1981) in a study on the effectiveness of basal readers discovered the following points: 1) basals failed to utilize the strengths and abilities of children entering

school, 2) basals assume that labeling, categorizing, classifying, and rhyming will generalize into reading, and 3) authors fail to concur on the content, goals, skills, and methods necessary for beginning reading. Basal publishers' descriptions do not accurately reflect the series, as well (Morrow, 1987). It also assumes that every child entering first grade will need the same rigid sequence of skills with no room for flexibility or individualization (Osburn & Bobruk, 1981).

Other criticisms of basals have been widespread. First, basals are condemned for the lack of control given to the student. The teacher, as guided by the manual, has made all the creative decisions for the lesson; the student is to follow the instructions, obey the decisions, and copy the print (Slaughter et al., 1985). Second, basals also concentrate on post-assessments and review rather than on instruction; however there is no pre-assessments for students who may have already acquired skills that are to be taught (Osburn & Bobruk, 1981). Third, the primary focus of basals is on word attack and word recognition. There is heavy attention to word decoding skills and word methods, so consequently the number of words in the stories are limited and repeated to meet this end (Osburn & Bobruk, 1981). These forced vocabulary stories prove to be dull and unappealing to children. Boys in particular, as indicated by their writing, seem to be uninterested in topics in the first grade readers (Hunt, 1985). Finally, there are few voluntary language activities in the basals series. Despite the current research indicating the correlation between higher

reading achievement and voluntary reading, basals do not view such activities as important. What few activities that are mentioned are present in the rarely used optional materials (Morrow, 1987).

The student in a basal dominated reading class will spend more time on workbook exercises, skills work, drills, and dittos than on actual reading (Edelsky et al., 1983) and reading should be the main goal of reading instruction. Writing instruction in a basal series consists of isolated, meaningless lessons on penmanship, punctuation, capitalization, vocabulary, and grammar; there is little or no instruction on creative or report writing (Edelsky et al., 1983).

In contrast, the whole language approach has made the primary goal of reading to be reading and writing to be writing. Understanding the text is the only reason for reading instruction (Ribowsky, 1985). Reading and decoding each word is not a necessity (Ribowsky, 1985), but making sense of the text and being able to discuss, share, and write about it is the central focus (Edelsky et al., 1983).

The whole language approach utilizes real literature stories and the child's own written stories as the primary reading material for the class. Vocabulary, skills, phonics, and comprehension are all discussed, but within the context of the story and as they come up. Absent are the phonics workbooks, basal workbooks, drill sheets, and dittos. Literature activities, writing exercises, art projects, and lessons arise naturally from the story that is being read. Teachers and students share the creative control of the lessons. Individualization

and creativity is encouraged and fostered. The class environment is one of flexibility (Ribowsky, 1985). Every student will not go through the same sequence of skills or do the same activities. The students' needs, strengths, and weaknesses are determined in individual conferences and skills instruction is taught in these conferences or in small groups when the situation for such instruction occurs. Set reading groups are not utilized, small groups change frequently depending on the needs of the students as well as their reading interests and class themes.

Whole language students acquire more meaningful vocabulary, related to their interests, than basal instructed students, and they acquire roughly the same vocabulary that is introduced in the basals and on the Dolch List (Shapiro & Gunderson, 1988). Whole language students also achieved greater word recognition skills and comprehension growth than basal students (Looby & Turner, 1987).

Whole Language Vs. Skills

Language arts instruction in the American schools today are comprised of segregated, isolated subjects: spelling, English, reading, handwriting, and phonics. Within each subject, the individual lessons are also segregated and isolated from one another with each lesson, or possibly a short series of lessons, dedicated to one specific skill. Once

this skill is mastered by the majority of students, the next skill, unrelated to the first, is then taught.

This bottom-up approach begins with the small components of the word, letters, and sounds, and then works its way up to the whole word, then the sentence, then the paragraph, and finally the story (Ribowsky, 1985). Decoding of print is the primary goal; alphabetic principles, phonemic segmentation, and reading letter by letter and word by word are the methods used to meet that goal (Ribowsky, 1985). Comprehension is viewed as an outgrowth of the decoding process (Ribowsky, 1985).

The whole language program is an integrated, meaningful process that combines listening, speaking, reading, and writing throughout the curriculum (Ribowsky, 1985). Language arts is not divided into separate subjects nor are the lessons divided into isolated skills. Language arts is learned naturally; reading is learned by reading, writing is learned by writing, individual skills (phonics, spelling, handwriting etc.) are taught within those mediums.

This top-down approach gives the students insight on the whole story first before the parts are discussed (Ribowsky, 1985). A nurturing, print enriched environment capitalizes the students' prior knowledge and skills as a starting place for their education (Ribowsky, 1985). Children are encouraged to utilize those skills in making guesses about the printed page (Ribowsky, 1985): what the words are, how to spell them and how to write stories. Errors are not viewed as

mistakes, but as important steps to the students' progress toward achieving literacy. Decoding skills is viewed as an outgrowth of comprehension (Ribowsky, 1985).

A skills teacher focuses attention on small bits of language, encourages the mastery of rules and phonics, supervises all reading activities, closely follows the manual, uses workbooks, flash cards, controlled vocabulary stories, and teaches children to remember facts (Watson, Crenshaw & King, 1984). A skills teacher posts alphabet charts and sound/symbol rules, has teacher constructed bulletin boards, and all activities and instructions are initiated by the teacher and is contingent on the text (Wilucki, 1984). Students in a skills classroom rarely look at books in their free time, very rarely write creatively (Wilucki, 1984), and share the teacher's view that good writing means good letter formation and all the words are spelled correctly (Watson et al., 1984).

A whole language teacher focuses on the larger units of language, encourages children to make sense of what they are reading, permits deviations from the text, involves the students in the planning of lessons and activities, uses library books, trade books, reference books, child authored stories, and encourages the students to experience and think about what they have read (Watson et al., 1984). A whole language teacher posts the children's writing and language experience stories, has teacher and student constructed bulletin boards, a wide collection of children literature books (three times as many as in a

skills classroom), and gives the students the flexibility to change, modify or control a lesson or activity (Wilucki, 1984). The students in a whole language classroom read and write creatively daily, engage is literary activities whenever possible (Rayers, 1987; Wilucki, 1984), and share the teacher's view that the purpose of good writing is to compose original stories (Watson et al., 1984).

Research by Ribowsky (1985) discovered the following points: 1) whole language students achieve significantly higher reading achievement scores, 2) score higher on standardized tests measuring linguistic, literacy, orthographic, and graphophonemic abilities, and 3) score significantly higher on a formal test of phonetic knowledge, although not having been directly instructed in phonics. Research by Looby and Turner (1987) determined that a whole language program did not affect differently students of different gender or ethnic background. Because of the individualization and flexibility that the program has, students' interests and needs are the primary goals for instruction. Finally Sinatra (1984) determined that a whole language approach is more effective than any other for kindergartners to second graders. Osburn and Bobruk (1981, p. 20) quoted Clay (1972) in her description of a successful student, "To be successful, children must use self correction. This involves the courage to make mistakes, the ear to recognize that an error has occurred and the patience to search for clues." A student in a whole language classroom will gain that courage and patience.

Reading and Writing Connection

Until recently, reading and writing have often been viewed as two separate processes independent from one another. Additionally, reading has often been viewed as the passive process of receiving ideas and acquiring information (Braun, 1984). Writing, on the other hand, has frequently been viewed as the active process of formulating ideas, creating meanings, and synthesizing language structure (Braun, 1984).

Currently, research has indicated that reading and writing are interrelated. Reading and writing are now viewed as "meaning making engagements. Both are purposeful, social, constructive acts" (Braun, 1984, p. 4). Similarities between the two processes were determined by Langer (1985) in her research: 1) reading and writing are purpose driven, meaning making activities, and 2) both use background knowledge to organize ideas. Differences of the two processes as stated by Langer (1985) are: 1) each has a primarily different purpose, (one meaning seeking, the other meaning generating), 2) each generate different patterns of cognitive knowledge, and 3) each has a difference in control, (more writing control, less reading control). Braun (1984) determined that writers move backward and forward as they plan, write, and revise their writing; the revision, itself, is done by reading. Readers must also move backward

and forward to experience the selection, elicit appropriate background knowledge, and alter and refine their present schema (Braun, 1984).

The relationship between the reading process and writing process is indicated in several recent studies. Perl (1983) concluded as a result of her survey that reading, writing, and listening are all connected through a negotiation process between the teacher and student, the student and himself, and the student to another student. Armstrong, in response to Braun's (1984) research, states that "The writing process should provide opportunities to help writers think like readers" (p. 27).

The stages of writing have been researched and documented by several researchers. Salem (1986) states the stages to be: 1) scribbling, 2) distinction between drawing and writing, 3) use of mechanics, 4) letter writing, 5) groups of letters, 6) words, 7) simple sentences with invented spelling, 8) group of sentences, 9) use of punctuation, and 10) discourse. Hunt (1985) enumerates his stages as follows: 1) unreadable, 2) non-narrative, no topic, 3) non- narrative, one topic, 4) intended narrative, and 5) narrative. Perl (1983) describes her principles of writing as being: 1) to experience writing by writing, 2) to observe one's own writing, 3) to experiment with different ways and forms of writing, 4) to collaborate with others, 5) to have a sense of audience, and 6) to take on the responsibility of being the author. Kirkpatrick (1986) mirrors Perl's views by stating in her study that children learn to write by writing, to read by reading, that

they must view themselves as writers using invented spelling and be worry-free about mistakes or failure.

Oral language, writing, and reading has also been the subject of many studies. Kasten and Clarke (1986) determines that meaningful oral language is essential to writing. Students, as they write, formulate ideas, make decisions, and revise and edit text through oral language (Kasten & Clarke, 1986). This oral language could be in the form of quietly rereading their text, orally talking to themselves about what they wrote, asking themselves questions or asking others questions to confirm or revise their information (Kasten & Clarke, 1984). Oral reading of text provides the writer with a strategy to solve their writing problems and gives them a valuable learning experience during their writing process.

The relationship between reading achievement and writing ability is another topic for research. Hayes (1987) determined that good writers have higher reading scores than average writers and that better writers tend to do more leisure reading. In Hayes' study (1987), students who were given a basic reading course made greater significant gains in reading comprehension and writing ability than students not given the course. Edelsky et al. (1983) concluded that low achieving students with little or no literary or writing background were writing, in a relatively short period of time, full page journal entries and reading award winning literature once exposed to a whole language reading/writing program. In less than a year, these same

children were "spontaneously discussing the literary merits of their own writing (and) the books they read, commenting on style, point of view, plot structure, and other literary elements" (Edelsky et al., 1983, p. 260). Mason, Peterman, Powell and Kerr (1988) cites Clay as stating that writing "plays a significant part in the early reading process. (It) provides experience where letters are built into words, which make up sentences... When a child writes she has to know a sound/symbol relationship, inherent in reading" (p. 4).

Invented Spelling

Spelling has always been a concern of parents regarding their children's work. It is one aspect, along with math computations, that parents can quickly correct and determine how their child is doing in school. If a homework paper is filled with misspelled words, the parent becomes worried over their child's progress. However, a student in a whole language classroom will bring home many papers filled with misspelled words and most of them will be uncorrected by the teacher.

Invented spelling is, by definition, spelling words the way the child feels or thinks they are spelled. He may use phonic clues, visual clues (what looks right) or simply guesses. He utilizes his background knowledge to solve his spelling dilemma. The teacher may choose one or two words at a time to correct with him, individually, or in a small group. She may read a book or write a language experience story that

incorporates the misspelled words commonly used by the group. The remaining words are left alone for the child to refine and correct on his own with just time and experience on his side.

Learning to spell should be done in a natural way, free of restraints, endless rules, confusing exceptions, and fear of being wrong (Kirkpatrick, 1986). The child must experiment with spelling, experience the words, visualize them, and not be afraid to take risks (Salem, 1986). In terms of writing stories, children should be allowed to write freely on the topic of their choice and without the constraints of spelling (Hunt, 1985). In early writing, it is the process that matters; the product and the audience is of little importance (Hunt, 1985).

Spelling has been researched numerous times and it is the consensus of several researchers that there are definite stages one must pass through. Kirkpatrick (1986) described these stages as: 1) precommunicative (random letters), 2) semiphonetic (first or last sound), 3) phonetic (spell as it sounds), 4) transitional (visual and memory clues), and 5) conventional (correct way). Children should be allowed to pass through these stages at their own pace; when they are ready, they will move from invented spelling to conventional spelling (Salem, 1986) but without the detest for writing that so may adults feel. Some researchers believe that insisting that children use conventional spelling will actually slow their writing process, hinder their creativity and therefore discourage them from writing further (Salem, 1986).

Salem (1986) concluded in her study that beginning readers who had experience with book handling and the alphabet, will use conventional spelling sooner than children who had less experience with books and the alphabet. In an unrelated study, Wilde (1986) discovered that between third and fourth grades, spelling, and punctuation dramatically improves. Fourth grade conventional spellers are not hindered by their third grade invented spelling. Also, Wilde (1986) determined that most invented spellers internalized phonetic and punctuation rules without benefit of formal instruction.

Summary

Writing should be one of the most important aspect of the educational curriculum today. Being successful in our world demands literacy and literacy demands writing competence. Yet, our educational system is failing students with ineffective and disjointed writing programs or no programs at all. The programs that do exist concentrate on the mechanical aspects of writing not the composing. Evaluation is not on the writing process but the written product; the teacher's red-pencil marks covers the student's auspicious writing attempt. This defeating and frustrating lesson results in a fearful and anxiety-ridden student who no longer wants to write, thus writer's apprehension.

Effective and motivating writing programs must be established in our schools' curriculum. One such program is the whole language approach. Whole language incorporates writing in every subject area utilizing a variety of forms, purposes, and audiences. It makes the goal of writing to be writing. Instruction emphasizes the writing stages: pre-writing, writing and revising; less emphasis is placed on the mechanical aspects of writing. When mechanics is taught, it is done within the context of a complete discourse and only as the need arises. The student's published books become a valuable addition to the classroom library not only for the author but for his/her classmates as well.

Based on this description, the whole language teacher should be able to harness the students' natural desire and curiosity to write. Students will emerge from this program as confident and proficient writers who are not only willing but eager participants. This researcher believes this to be the case; the purpose of this study is to justify or refute this claim.

Chapter III

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to determine if students engaged in a whole language program will be significantly different in their level of writing apprehension and the quality of their writing from those engaged in a skills orientated language program.

Questions

1. Is there a statistically significant difference in the level of writing apprehension from students engaged in whole language programs to those in basal/skills development programs?

2. Is there a statistically significant difference in the level of writer competency from students engaged in whole language programs to those in basal/skills development programs?

Design of the Study

Null Hypotheses:

1. Students engaged in a whole language program will exhibit no statistically significant difference in their writing apprehension than students engaged in a skills orientated language program based on scores from the Writing Apprehension Test.

2. Students engaged in a whole language program will exhibit no statistically significant difference in their writer competence than students engaged in a skills orientated language program based on scores from the Basic Writing Scale.

Subjects:

The subjects of this study were comprised of four intact sixth grade classrooms from two rural school districts in Western New York and contained students of varying ability. Two of the classrooms, containing forty-seven participating students, were from a school which utilizes the whole language program. Two of the students were eliminated from the sample since they were not in the school district for the entire six years, and therefore did not have the whole language approach. Four other students did not participate in all the components of the study, so they were eliminated, thereby bringing the sample number down to forty-one. The remaining two classrooms, also

containing forty-one students, were from a school utilizing a basal/skills orientated language program. The total sample number was eighty-two (n = 82).

Materials:

Materials for this study included:

1. Writer's Apprehension Test by John Daly and Michael Miller (1975a).

2. The Basic Writing Scale by Elaine G. Wangberg and Mary K. Reutten (1986).

Procedure:

The study began by gathering the reading achievement scores obtained on standardized reading tests from the participating students' second grade records. The researcher then administered the Writing Apprehension Test to all students and collected writing samples from each of them. The writing samples were taken from a routine writing assignment as defined by the classroom teacher and the language arts/reading textbooks.

The Writing Apprehension Test was scored for each student. The scoring procedure was as follows: the thirteen positively worded items on the WAT were scored with the "strongly agree" yielding a value of 5, the "agree" a 4 and so on. The thirteen negatively worded items were scored with the "strongly agree" yielding a value of 1, "agree" a 2 and

so on. The sum of each the student's items yield the total score. The above procedure was described in an personal interview with WAT author Dr. John Daly, who changed his scoring procedure from his original article (Daly & Miller, 1975a).

The writing samples were scored by two independent readers using the The Basic Writing Scale. If two scores of a single paper were four points or less apart, the scores were averaged. If a discrepancy of greater than four points occurred, the paper in dispute was read by a third independent reader. The two closest scores were then averaged.

Chapter IV

Statistical Analysis[1]

The analysis of the data was comprised of three components:

1. The second grade reading scores for the two groups were analyzed using independent t tests to determine if the groups were different to a statistically significant degree.

2. If there was no statistically significant difference between the two groups, the writing sample scores and the WAT scores were analyzed using independent t tests. If there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups, the scores were analyzed using an analysis of covariance.

3. A correlational analysis was also carried out between the scores within each group as well as to their corresponding second grade reading achievement scores.

Findings:

In analyzing the second grade reading scores, a t test between the means of the whole language group ($\overline{X}$ = 69.39) and the basal/skills language group ($\overline{X}$ = 59.15) indicated that the two groups were not

[1]Bartz, Albert E. (1981). Basic Statistical Concepts, 2nd Ed. Minnesota: Burgess Publishing Company.

significantly different (t = 1.98, df = 80, $p < 0.05$). Based on this information, it can be assumed that both groups were academically the same prior to entering the bulk of their schooling. Thus, most differences in their reading/writing abilities can be attributed to their perspective programs.

READING SCORES COMPARISON

Group	*Mean*	*SD*	*t test*
Whole Language	69.39	20.80	1.98
Basal/Skills	59.15	25.72	

As a result of the similar academic abilities of the two groups, t test scores were calculated between the means of WAT scores and the Basic Writing Scale scores. The WAT scores of the whole language group ($\overline{X}$ = 65.83) were not significantly different (t = 0.12, df = 80, $p >$ 0.05) from the scores of the basal/skills group ($\overline{X}$ = 66.34). However, the results of the t test between the Basic Writing Scale mean scores indicated that the whole language group ($\overline{X}$ = 31.26) was significantly different (t = 5.80, df = 80, $p < 0.001$) from the basal/skills group ($\overline{X}$ = 25.48).

WRITING APPREHENSION TEST SCORES COMPARISON

Group	*Mean*	*SD*	*t test*
Whole Language	65.83	16.06	0.12
Basal/Skills	66.34	20.92	

WRITING COMPETENCY COMPARISON

Group	*Mean*	*SD*	*t test*
Whole Language	31.24	5.27	5.80
Basal/Skills	25.34	3.83	

With the level of significance of the writing competency being so high, further statistical analysis was warranted. Therefore, the individual scores of the Basic Writing Scale were subdivided into its three sections: Content (creativity and details), Organization (structure and cohesion) and Usage and Mechanics (punctuation and grammar). The means and standard deviations were calculated for each section and a t test was then computed between the means. In two of the three sections, the results were significant. The t values for Content (t = 7.47, df = 80) and Organization (t = 6.02, df = 80) were significant at the p value of 0.001. There was no significant difference between the means of the Usage and Mechanics scores (t = 0.71, df = 80, $p > 0.05$).

WRITING COMPONENTS COMPARISON

Content	*Mean*	*SD*	*t test*
Whole Language	14.684	2.53	7.47
Basal Skills	10.74	2.25	
Organization	***Mean***	***SD***	***t test***
Whole Language	7.29	1.18	6.02
Basal/Skills	5.59	1.38	

Mechanics	*Mean*	*SD*	*t test*
Whole Language	9.27	1.98	0.71
Basal/Skills	9.01	1.18	

Because of the obtained significant difference between the two groups in writing competency, the two groups were separated in order to derive the Pearson product moment correlation. In the case of the whole language group, the only significant correlation was between the second grade reading scores and the WAT scores (r = -0.54, df = 39, p < 0.05). The remaining correlations between reading scores to writing competency (r = 0.26, df = 39, p > 0.05) and writing apprehension to writing competency (r = -0.23, df = 39, p > 0.05) were not significant.

In the case of the basal/skills language group, again, only one significant correlation was found between the second grade reading scores and writing competency (r = 0.50, df = 39, p < 0.05). The remaining correlations between the reading scores and writing apprehension (r = -0.11, df = 39, p > 0.05) and writing apprehension and writing competency (r = -0.05, df = 39, p > 0.05) were not significant.

PEARSON PRODUCT CORRELATIONS

Variables	*Whole Language*	*Basal/Skills*
Read.-WAT	-0.11	-0.54
Reading-Writing	0.50	0.26
WAT-Writing	-0.05	-0.23

Analysis and Interpretation of Hypotheses:

The first null hypothesis suggested that there would be no significant difference between writing apprehension of a whole language class and the writing apprehension of a basal/skills language class. This study failed to reject that hypothesis. In both classes, students appear to have moderate or "normal" apprehension. Few students were classified as being high apprehensive or low apprehensive. In the whole language group (n = 41), 7 were classified as high apprehensives and 7 were low apprehensives. In the basal/skills language group (n = 41), 5 were classified as high and 7 as low.

The second null hypothesis predicted that there would be no significant difference in writing competency between the same groups. This hypothesis was rejected by this study. The writing competency of the whole language group was significantly higher than that of the basal/skills language group. Under further analysis, the content and organizational components of the whole language writing samples were also significantly higher than the basals/skills language writing samples. However, the mechanics of both group samples were not significantly different.

A point made earlier that needs to be reiterated was the rationale for the researcher not assigning the same topic to all the students. Giving an assigned topic would have been a disruption in the perspective programs in which the students were engaged, particularly

the whole language approach. A whole language writing lesson utilizes real literature stories, pre-writing activities throughout the curriculum, listening activities, cooperative learning and instruction in editing and revising. The primary focus is on the content and the process of writing. Basal/skill approaches utilize structured lessons centering on individual components of the writing process, with the primary focus on mechanics. Pre-writing activities and revision is not included in a routine lesson. The writing samples collected had to be the result of these distinctly diverse approaches and not from a contrived assignment given by an outsider.

In analyzing the results of the Pearson product moment correlations for the whole language class, a significant negative correlation existed between the reading achievement scores and the writing apprehension scores. Students with higher reading achievement had lower writing apprehension. In contrast, the basal/skills language group demonstrated a significant positive correlation between the reading scores and the writing competency scores- the higher the reading scores, the higher the writing competency.

Summary:

The results of this study indicated that although there is no apparent difference in writing apprehension between the whole language group and basal/skills group, there was a significant

difference between the writing competencies of the two groups. Further analysis implies that this difference between the writing samples occurred in the content and organizational areas of the writing samples.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Conclusions:

Writing competency is extremely important in today's society, yet only recently have researchers and educators become aware of the lack of writing competency in the adults of our society. Writing apprehension plays a major role in the lack of writing competency. A question that was asked in the beginning of this paper was what came first-- writing apprehension or poor writing. This study seems to suggest that poor writing precedes the fear of writing. Students participating in this study did not exhibit writing apprehension, but many of them did exhibit poor writing. Only time will be able to determine if these less competent writers will become the apprehensive writers in the years to come.

Whole language programs have been under much examination as to the effectiveness of the holistic approach to teaching writing and, more specifically, the mechanics of writing. It is the belief of some educators that whole language programs do not teach enough grammar, spelling and punctuation. Yet, this study reveals students participating in a whole language program will in fact be as proficient in the areas of grammar and punctuation as their counterparts, but will also become better, more creative, and more organized writers.

This study also re-affirms the association between reading achievement and writing. In each class, a connection was made between the reading achievement scores and writing, either in writing apprehension (whole language group, negative correlation) or in writing competency (basal/skills group, positive correlation).

Implications for Research:

Researchers have determined that writing apprehension does exist in college students and adults in the workplace (Daly & Miller, 1975c; Daly & Shamo, 1978; Fadiman & Howard, 1979). Yet, it did not exist in these sixth grade students, regardless of the language program in which they participated. A question that needs to be studied is, where does the apprehension begin and for whom? Does the apprehension begin in high school and only in the less competent students? Or do some of the competent sixth grade writers become apprehensive once they reach the more demanding high school courses? An intriguing study would be to follow these same students through high school and college to see what lies ahead for them.

Another component of this study that should be researched further is the continuing effect of whole language teaching on students. Will students in high school and college who were taught the whole language way continue to be more competent writers with little or moderate apprehension? Conversely, will basal/skills language

students continue to be less competent? Both questions merit further investigation.

Implications for Classroom Practice:

The major characteristic of writing in the whole language style is the freedom of choice, the opportunity to take risks, and the lack of restrictions and destructive criticisms concerning the students' work. Whole language students are comfortable with writing creatively and taking risks in their writing. The students in this study read the story "Fat Men from Space" by Daniel Manus Pinkwater as a pre-writing exercise. After much discussion of the story and related activities over a period of several days, they were assigned to write and/or illustrate a story on aliens. No further directions were given as to the content or style of the work. That was left for the student to imagine. Further assistance was given either from the teacher or other students depending on the writer's request. Once the students' first drafts were completed, they revised and edited the story one to two times, depending on the individual student. A final copy was then made and, in some cases, illustrations were drawn.

Basal/skills students are used to a very regimented, structured fill-in-the-blank writing lesson or workbook page, if a writing lesson exists at all. The students in this study were given a choice of three topics to write about: "If Only," "Parents," and "Thanksgiving." The first topic lent itself to creative thinking, but the remaining two were

more limiting as to the content and writing style. There were no pre-writing activities or discussions on any of the topics nor was there an editing and revising process. The students were given the assignment, asked to do their very best and given no further directions or assistance. It is easy to understand why these students' writing samples showed less creativity, fewer details and little or no originality.

The writing teacher should allow the student writer to explore his imagination and feel free to write creatively without having the fear of the red-pencil hanging over him. Creative writing should not be taught through workbooks or textbooks, but with a pen, several blank pieces of paper and the student's own imagination as his guide.

REFERENCES

Bartz, A. E. (1981). Basic Statistical Concepts, 2nd Ed. Minnesota: Burgess Publishing Company.

Bennett, S. (1981). What everyone should know (has know but done little to implement) about evaluating students' writing (Report No. CS 207 265). Austin, Texas: University of Texas At Austin. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 244 023)

Braun, C. (1984). Reading/Writing connection: A case analysis (Report No. CS 008 106). Alberta, Canada: Colloquium on Research in Reading and Language Arts in Canada. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 266 403)

Clark, R. P. (1985). Teaching children to write. National Forum: Phi Kappa Phi Journal, 65 (4), 29-31.

Daly, J., & Shamo, W. (1978). Academic decisions as a function of writing apprehension. Research in the Teaching of English, 12, 119-126.

Daly, J. & Miller, M. (1975a). The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. Research in the Teaching of English, 9, 242-249.

Daly, J. & Miller, M. (1975b). Apprehension of writing as a predictor of message intensity. Journal of Psychology, 89 (75), 175-177.

Daly, J. & Miller, M. (1975c). Further studies on writing apprehension: SAT scores, success expectations, willingness to take advanced courses and sex differences. Research in the Teaching of English, 9, 250-256.

Daly, J. (1978). Writing apprehension and writing competency. Journal of Educational Research, 72, (11), 10-14.

Daly, J. (1979). Writing apprehension in the classroom: Teacher role expectancies of the apprehensive writer. Research in the Teaching of English, 13 (38), 37-44.

De Gutschow. (1982). Writing anxiety and the gifted student writer. Wisconsin English Journal, 24 (3), 9-13.

Edelsky, C., Draper, K., & Smith, K. (1983). Hookin' 'em at the start of school in a `whole language' classroom. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 14, 257-281.

Fadiman, C. & Howard, J. (1979). Empty pages: A search for writing competence in school and society. California: Fearon Pitman Publishers.

Gorrell, D. (1982). Are basic writers afraid to write? Wisconsin English Journal, 24 (3), 14-16.

Graves, D. & Calkins, L. M. (1980). Children learn the writer's craft. Language Arts, 57, 207-213.

Graves, D. (1976). Let's get rid of this welfare mess in the teaching of writing. Language Arts, 53, 645-651.

Graves, D. (1977). Language arts textbooks: A writing process evaluation. Language Arts, 54, 817-823.

Graves, D. (1978). We won't let them write. Language Arts, 55, 635-640.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Hayes, C. (1987). Teaching basic reading to basic writers. Journal of Reading, 31 (2), 100-108.

Heaton, H. & Pray, P. (1982). Writing anxiety: Reasons and reduction techniques. Wisconsin English Journal, 24 (3), 2-8.

Heaton, H. (1980). A study of writing anxiety among high school students including case histories of 3 high and 3 low anxiety students (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41 (5), 2068A.

Hudelson, S. (1983). Janice: Becoming a writer of English. (Report No. FL 013 993). Toronto, Ontario: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 249 760)

Hunt, B. C. (1985). A leprechaun in King Arthur's court: Topic, theme and mode in the writing of first graders using invented spelling (Report No. CS 209 229). Sturbridge, MA:

Massachusetts Reading Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 260 439)

Josten, M. (1982). Encouraging junior high writers. Wisconsin English Journal, 24 (3), 17-21.

Kasten, W. & Clarke, B. (1986). A study of 3rd and 4th grade students' oral language during the writing process in elementary classrooms (Report No. CS 210 226). London, England: International Reading Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 277 025)

Kirkpatrick, K. G. (1986). A longitudinal study of journal writing in kindergarten and first grade (Report No. CS 210 418). Memphis, TN: Mid-South Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 281 201)

Langer, J. (1986). The research plan: Children reading and writing. In Children Reading and Writing: Structures and Strategies, (pp. 9-17). New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Looby, T., Turner, J. (1987). Improved reading achievement of sixth grade students when using a whole language approach in conjunction with a basal reading program (Report No. CS 009 000). Phoenix, AR: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 290 124)

Maier, V. (1987). The Impact of the impressions program and whole language on elementary students. Unpublished master's thesis, State University of New York, Brockport.

Mason, J., Peterman, C., Powell, B. & Kerr, B. (1988). Reading and writing attempts by kindergarten children after book reading by teachers (Report No. CS 009 088). Urbana, Ill: Center for the Study of Reading. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 293 089)

McCroskey, J., Richmond, V., Daly, J., Falcione, R. (1977). Studies of the relationship between communication apprehension and self-esteem. Human Communication Research, 3 (3), 269-277.

Morrow, L. (1987). Promoting voluntary reading: Activities represented in basal reader manuals. Reading Research and Instruction, 26 (3), 187-202.

National Council of Teachers of English. (1979). Standards for basic skill writing programs. Language Arts, 56, 836-838.

Osburn, B & Bobruk, T. (1981) The BASAL: What does it demand of the beginning reader (Report No. CS 006 798). Dallas, TX: National Reading Conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 220 809)

Perl, S. (1983). How teachers teach the writing process. The Elementary School Journal, 84 (1), 19-24.

Rayers, C. (1987). Writing should be sharing. Reading, 21 (2), 115-124.

Ribowsky, H. (1985). The effects of a code emphasis approach and a whole language approach upon emergent literacy of kindergarten children (Report No. CS 008 397). Brooklyn, NY: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 269 720)

Rosen, R. (1982). Making a writing class a community. Wisconsin English Journal, 24 (3), 22-24.

Rubin, A. (1980). Making stories, making sense. Language Arts, 57, 285-298.

Salem, L. (1986). First graders' ability to read their creative writing (Invented spelling versus conventional spelling) (Report No. Cs 008 569). Urbana, Ill: National Council of Teachers of English. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 958)

Schiff, P. (1979). ...Stand up, sit down, write, write, write! Language Arts, 56, 753-756.

Shapiro, J. & Gunderson, L. (1988). A comparison of vocabulary generated by grade 1 students in whole language classrooms and basal reader vocabulary. Reading, Research and Instruction, 27 (2), 40-46.

Shaughnessy, M. P. (1977). Errors and expectations: A guide for the teacher of basic writing. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sinatra, R. (1984). How a holistic language arts curriculum influenced the reading and writing proficiency of kindergarten and primary grade children (Report No. CS 209 487). Baltimore, MD: International Reading Conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 264 583)

Slaughter, H., Haussler, M., Franks, A., Jilbert, K. & Silentman, I. (1985). Contextual differences in oral and written discourse during early literacy instruction (Report No. 008 123). Chicago,

Ill: American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 260 380)

Tway, E. (1980). Teacher responses to children's writing. Language Arts, 57, 763-772.

Walmsley, S. (1980). What elementary teachers know about writing. Language Arts, 57, 732-734.

Wangberg, E. G. & Reutten, M. K. (1986). Whole language approaches for developing and evaluating basic writing ability. Lifelong Learning, 9 (8), 13-15,24-25.

Watson, D., Crenshaw, S. & King, D. (1984). Two approaches to reading: Whole language and skills (Report No. CS 007 761). Atlanta, GA: International Reading Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247 546)

Wilde, S. (1986). An analysis of the development of spelling and punctuation in selected third and fourth grade children (Report No. CS 210 727). Tucson, AR: University of Arizona. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 288 188)

Wilucki, B. (1984). The impact of teachers' orientation to literacy on children's developing concepts of written language in kindergarten (Report No. CS 208 544). Urbana, Ill: National Council of Teachers of English. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247 601)

Appendices

WRITING APPREHENSION TEST[2]

Directions: Below are a series of statements about writing. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by circling whether you (1) strongly agree, (2) agree, (3) are uncertain, (4) disagree, or (5) strongly disagree with the statement. While some of these statements may seem repetitious, take your time and try to be as honest as possible. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

		SA	A	UN	D	SD
1.	I avoid writing	1	2	3	4	5
2.	I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I look forward to writing down my ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I am afraid of writing essays when I know they will be evaluated.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Taking a composition course is very frightening.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	Handing in a composition makes me feel good.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Expressing my ideas about writing seems to be a waste of time.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I would enjoy submitting my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication.	1	2	3	4	5

[2]Daly, John & Miller, Michael. (1975a). The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. Research in the Teaching of English, 9, 242-249.

10.	I like to write my ideas down.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas in writing.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	I like to have my friends read what I have written.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	I'm nervous about writing.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	People seem to enjoy what I write.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	I enjoy writing.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	I never seem to be able to clearly write down my ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Writing is a lot of fun.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	I expect to do poorly in composition classes even before I enter them.	1	2	3	4	5
19.	I like seeing my thoughts on paper.	1	2	3	4	5
20.	Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience.	1	2	3	4	5
21.	I have a terrible time organizing my ideas in a composition course.	1	2	3	4	5
22.	When I hand in a composition I know I am going to do poorly.	1	2	3	4	5
23.	It's easy for me to write good compositions.	1	2	3	4	5
24.	I don't think I write as well as most other people.	1	2	3	4	5
25.	I don't like my composition to be evaluated.	1	2	3	4	5
26.	I'm no good at writing.	1	2	3	4	5

BASIC WRITING SCALE[3]

Analytic Scale for Holistic Scoring of Writing Samples

Scoring Guide: High 3
Middle 2
Low 1

I. CONTENT

A. Sense of Voice; the writer's stance
H. Individual, clear, consistent
M. Bland, general, sometimes confusing, absent at times
L. Absent most of the time

B. Sense of audience
H. Clear, sustained and controlled (consistently attempts to engage reader)
M. Unclear, sometimes present
L. Absent most of the time

C. Purpose
H. Clear; incidents well chosen
M. Unclear at times; the relationship to the incidents to the purpose not clear at times
L. Unclear; incidents show little relationship to purpose

D. Development
H. Sufficient to support main idea
M. A moderate amount; ideas not fully supported
L. Insufficient

E. Details and Wording
H. Effective, concrete and interesting
M. Some effective, concrete and interesting details
L. Mostly absent; ineffective, flat and uninteresting

F. Quality of ideas about the incident or topic
H. Imaginative, original, perceptive, insightful
M. Mostly predictable; shows some originality
L. Unimaginative, unoriginal, predictable

---

[3]Wangberg, Elaine G. & Reutten, Mary K. (1986). Whole language approaches to evaluating basic writing ability. Lifelong Learning, 9, (8), 13-15, 24-25.

II. ORGANIZATION

G. Beginning/ middle/ end
H. Logical sequencing of narrative; clear sense of beginning, middle, closing
M. Moderately logical sequencing of narrative; moderate sense of beginning, middle, closing
L. Illogical sequencing of narrative; no sense of beginning, middle, closing

H. Cohesion/coherence/transition
H. Effective throughout
M. Some present
L. Absent or inappropriate

I. Paragraphing
H. Intentional and effective
M. Attempted; intentional and effective at times
L. Absent

III. USAGE AND MECHANICS

J. Sentences
H. Mature; variation in length and pattern; few if any structural weaknesses; good sense of sentence boundary
M. Some variation in length and pattern; some structural weaknesses; some sense of sentence boundary
L. No variation in length and pattern; many structural weaknesses; no sense of sentence boundary

K. Usage
H. Reasonable mastery of Edited American English; consistent verb and tense agreement; correct case and number; correct word choice (don't penalize for spelling)
M. Some mastery of Edited American English; consistent verb and tense agreement; correct case and number; some correct word choice
L. Little mastery of Edited American English; little consistency in verb and tense agreement; little correctness case and number; incorrect word choice

L. Punctuation
H. Effective and consistent use of correct punctuation
M. Some use of correct punctuation
L. Little or no use of correct punctuation

M. Spelling
H. Correct spelling of common words; mostly correct spelling of others
M. Mostly correct spelling of common words; some correct spelling of others
L. Frequent incorrect spelling

WHOLE LANGUAGE GROUP-RAW DATA CHART

ID#	Reading Scores	Writing Apprehension Scores	Writing Competency Scores	Content Scores	Organization Scores	Mechanics Scores
1	94	42	30.0	14.0	6.5	9.5
2	94	47	26.0	12.5	6.5	7.0
3	37	74	29.0	12.5	7.5	9.0
4	98	34	33.5	17.0	8.0	8.5
5	81	54	28.5	14.5	7.0	7.0
6	94	54	37.5	17.0	9.0	11.5
7	68	71	29.5	13.5	7.5	8.5
8	47	54	25.0	12.5	5.5	7.0
10	81	81	37.0	16.5	8.5	12.0
11	37	84	27.5	13.0	6.5	8.0
12	47	59	28.5	12.5	8.0	8.0
13	26	92	33.5	16.5	8.0	9.0
14	81	57	34.5	16.0	8.0	10.5
15	43	101	30.0	15.5	7.0	7.5
16	87	41	39.0	18.0	9.0	12.0
17	87	73	35.5	15.5	8.0	12.0
18	75	57	33.0	15.5	8.0	9.5
19	94	45	34.0	17.5	6.5	10.0
20	56	65	19.5	10.0	4.5	5.0
21	90	88	38.0	18.0	9.0	11.0
22	94	72	27.5	12.0	7.5	8.0
23	68	61	36.0	17.0	7.5	11.5
24	87	75	36.0	17.5	7.5	11.0
25	56	73	32.5	16.0	7.5	9.0
26	72	49	38.0	18.0	9.0	11.0
27	98	61	36.5	17.0	8.0	11.5
28	52	66	36.0	18.0	8.0	10.0
30	81	58	21.5	11.0	6.0	4.5
32	75	71	37.0	17.0	8.5	11.5
33	56	60	28.0	12.5	7.0	8.5
34	68	76	25.5	11.5	6.5	7.5
35	81	58	30.5	14.5	6.0	10.0
37	87	67	28.0	11.5	6.5	10.0
38	87	83	20.5	9.5	4.0	7.0
39	57	72	37.5	18.0	8.5	11.0
40	68	37	38.5	18.0	8.5	12.0
41	77	55	29.0	13.5	6.0	9.5
42	55	62	36.0	15.5	8.5	12.0
43	42	90	24.5	12.0	6.0	6.5
45	40	89	27.5	12.5	7.5	7.5
47	27	91	25.5	11.5	6.0	8.0
Sum	**2845**	**2699**	**1281**	**602**	**299**	**380**
Avg	**69.39**	**65.83**	**31.24**	**14.68**	**7.29**	**9.27**
Std	**20.80**	**16.06**	**5.27**	**2.53**	**1.18**	**1.98**

BASAL/SKILLS LANGUAGE GROUP-RAW DATA CHART

ID#	Reading Scores	Writing Apprehension Scores	Writing Competency Scores	Content Scores	Organization Scores	Mechanics Scores
3	50	96	27.5	11.5	7.0	9.0
5	5	70	21.0	9.5	4.0	7.5
6	74	48	23.5	9.5	4.5	9.5
7	56	73	32.0	13.5	7.5	11.0
8	41	50	21.5	8.0	5.5	8.0
9	74	74	32.0	13.0	8.0	11.0
13	41	66	25.0	12.0	5.5	7.5
16	68	26	23.0	10.5	4.0	8.5
20	50	50	22.0	8.0	5.5	8.5
22	86	58	26.5	11.5	6.0	9.0
23	50	50	30.0	12.5	6.5	11.0
31	78	73	28.0	13.0	6.0	9.0
34	78	54	24.0	9.5	6.0	8.5
38	62	61	22.0	8.0	4.0	10.0
39	78	61	29.0	12.0	7.5	9.5
42	23	57	21.0	9.5	3.5	8.0
43	86	38	27.0	11.5	4.5	11.0
44	81	29	33.0	16.0	8.5	8.5
45	28	41	26.5	11.5	5.0	10.0
48	23	102	24.0	12.0	4.0	8.0
49	50	60	22.0	9.0	4.0	9.0
50	92	87	23.0	7.5	5.5	10.0
51	86	84	26.0	10.5	6.5	9.0
57	92	75	29.0	12.5	6.5	10.0
58	92	50	28.0	12.5	5.5	10.0
61	71	71	22.0	8.5	5.0	8.5
62	92	43	33.0	14.5	9.0	9.5
65	68	101	21.0	8.0	6.0	7.0
67	95	43	29.0	11.5	6.5	11.0
68	62	98	29.0	13.5	7.0	8.5
69	26	33	20.5	7.0	4.5	9.0
70	99	111	30.0	13.0	7.0	10.0
72	17	87	21.0	10.5	3.5	7.0
74	36	87	30.0	15.0	6.0	9.0
75	31	75	19.0	7.0	3.5	8.5
76	43	78	23.5	7.5	5.0	11.0
77	86	50	22.5	8.5	5.5	8.5
79	50	86	23.0	10.5	4.5	8.0
80	56	86	21.5	11.0	4.0	6.5
83	36	70	24.0	10.0	6.0	8.0
85	13	68	23.5	10.0	5.0	8.5
Sum	**2425**	**2720**	**1039**	**441**	**229**	**370**
Avg	**59.15**	**66.34**	**25.34**	**10.74**	**5.59**	**9.01**
Std	**25.72**	**20.92**	**3.83**	**2.25**	**1.38**	**1.18**